SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

26th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XXVI, No. 13 | P. O. Box 6226A, Washington, D. C. 20015 | © August 1, 1996

Except for Defense and NIH, R&D in the Doldrums

On the eve of a month-long Congressional recess, the appropriations process was moving last week toward another year of standstill budgets or moderate decline for most of the government's science and technology agencies in fiscal 1997, which begins October 1. However, there were several big exceptions.

Along party lines, Congress has voted big increases for defense research, particularly for anti-missile programs, raising the Pentagon's R&D budget by 8 percent, to $37.5 billion out of total federal R&D spending of $73 billion. Criticizing the missile program as premature and a threat to the Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty, the White House has threatened a veto. No laggard himself in pushing defense research, Clinton has backed off from a pledge early in his Presidency for an even division of funds for federal civilian and military R&D.

Marked for termination by Congress were the two largescale industrial R&D programs favored by the Clinton Administration and reviled by Republicans as "corporate welfare," the Pentagon's Technology Reinvestment Project, which aims to exploit civilian research for military benefit, and the Advanced Technology Program in the Department of Commerce. With strong White House support, both have survived previous wipe-out attempts, leading to expectations of another rescue effort.

On the upside, nicely treated, as usual, was the National Institutes of Health. After leading the pack last year with a 5.7 percent budget increase, NIH emerged from the House this time with a 6.5 percent increase—as recommended by the coalition of health and research lobbies that stand guard over NIH affairs.

However, the fiscal terrain on Capitol Hill is so difficult that there's no certainty of matching generosity in the Senate, where the distribution of domestic discretionary funds among appropriations subcommittees was not as favorable to NIH as it was in the House.

The Senate budget deliberations involving NIH were put aside last week while the leadership huddled about scraping up additional funds for the NIH appropriations subcommittee, which also provides money for the Departments of

(Continued on Page 2)

9 Former Top R&D Officials Form Consulting Company

Three former Presidential science advisors and six other alumni of the upper ranks of the federal R&D establishment have set up a profit-seeking organization to counsel US and foreign companies, universities and government agencies "in charting courses through the maze that is the federal research and development system."

That description of services for sale is contained in a birth announcement sent out last week by the Washington Advisory Group, a limited liability company that has entered the capital city's packed field of senior have-beens with government experience for sale. The announcement says the nine founders [Box, Page 3] "are assisted by a network of equally distinguished associates drawn from the US and world scientific and engineering community." The associates are not identified.

Individually, most, if not all, of the charter members have served as consultants, board members or advisors for corporations, universities, and other organizations. In doing so, they have followed in the footsteps of innumerable ex-members of Congress and other former government officials who solo or collectively have traded on their knowledge of government. What's unprecedented about the newborn Washington Advisory Group is the banding together of former top-level government R&D eminences into a single business organization.

The startup is on a cautious basis, with the notables in this

(Continued on Page 3)

In Brief

Busy President Clinton has apparently registered complaints that he's shortchanging the science establishment on cherished ceremonial rites. On July 19, Clinton took time from pre-election hopscotching around the country for a White House awards ceremony for the National Medals of Science and Technology. He skipped the proceedings early in his Administration but, after the establishment muttered its disappointments to Science and Technology Advisor John Gibbons, the President showed up last year.

Where's PCAST?—the President's Committee of Advisors for Science and Technology, the highest-ranking body in the federal R&D advisory system. The 19-member Committee, laden with academic and corporate brass, etc., last met in April, for a customary two-day gathering. The June meeting was cancelled, because of the delayed federal budget, they say, and the next meeting is scheduled for late September. Members' attendance is pretty high on the first day of the meeting, but regularly falls off sharply on the second day.

Science to the People: NSF's press office went into high gear last month over a new audience for its chief, Director Neal Lane, who frequently addresses academic and scientific audiences. This time he was talking to an organization drawn from the neighborhood of NSF headquarters, the Arlington (Va.) Rotary Club. Scientists benefit from dialog with the public, Lane told them, adding, "Who better than Rotarians to engage in these discussions?"

Budget Hearing Casts No Light on 2002 R&D Plans

The House Science Committee tried last month to determine how government research programs would be affected by President Clinton's plan for severe cuts in total spending to balance the federal budget by the year 2002. But after several hours of testimony by budget specialists, the fiscal fog had thickened to the point where Rep. John Olver (D-Mass.) exclaimed in exasperation, "This is truly 'Alice in Wonderland' what we're looking at here."

Albert Teich, who picks over federal budget data for the American Association for the Advancement of Science, noted that "neither the President nor Congress included specific details of R&D funding in their outyear projection"—a point also noted by James Blum, Deputy Director of the Congressional Budget Office.

Clarity was not advanced by the next round of witnesses, the chiefs of NASA, the National Science Foundation and the Office of Energy Research in the Department of Energy. They all agreed that science is important, times are tough, budget balancing is necessary and the future is unpredictable.

The hearing, on July 23-24, was inspired by the plausible assumption among Congressional Republicans that the long-term balanced budget presented by President Clinton in March is a political gesture, not a fiscal plan.

If, as the President claims for his plan, 2002 spending would be cut at least 7 percent, in real terms, below 1996 spending, what's being done now to prepare for the plunge? asked Science Committee Chairman Robert Walker (R-Pa.).

Referring to cryptic remarks on past occasions by several R&D agency heads, Walker said, "Some have publicly stated that they were told by OMB [Office of Management and Budget] to ignore the levels and not to take any action to meet these numbers."

Appearing as a witness, Senator Kit Bond (R-Mo.), Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee for NASA, NSF and other agencies, accused the White House of "keeping two sets of books."

NASA's Dan Goldin declared that "the budget numbers are real." NASA is doing more with less, he said, and further cuts may be made, "because there are still marginal activities in NASA." But, he said, he doesn't believe in cutting programs now in anticipation of further budget reductions. Reminded that Clinton's 2002 plan would leave NASA with about $3 billion less than today's budget, Goldin said, "I am prepared to argue my case on a year-by-year basis."

NSF Director Lane said that a "balanced budget is far from a *fait accompli*," adding that "the budget has been and always will be an annual affair." At present, he said, NSF has a "relatively healthy bottom line."

Martha Krebs, of DOE, told of vast savings achieved through departmental economies. Despite these overall reductions, she said, DOE's science programs received slight budget increases last year. With the others, she stressed the importance of stability in funding.

Unenlightened about the long-term future of federal research funding, despite nearly six hours of testimony, the committee called it quits.

Appropriations Bills

(Continued from Page 1)

Education and Labor, as well as NIH's sister agencies in the Department of Health and Human Services.

Among the other major science and technology agencies: The National Science Foundation was voted $3.2 billion in the House, $55 million above this year's budget, $50 million less than the President requested. The Senate Appropriations Committee then topped the House figure by $22 million. The outcome is a bit better than it appears, since NSF's academic infrastructure program, budgeted for $100 million this year, drops to zero in the House and Senate bills for 1997, thus freeing money for other purposes. But no matter how well the Foundation shares the scarcity, its purchasing power will decline slightly next year.

The Department of Energy's basic science and high-energy physics budgets went up by a ground-losing percentage point or two in both the House and Senate bills.

NASA funding declined slightly, while the House voted a 3 percent increase for the Agricultural Research Service and a 7 percent reduction for the Ag Department's Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service.

Though Congress has been moving along at an unexpectedly speedy pace in the appropriations process, there's still a long way to go before House and Senate bills are reconciled in conference, passed in final form and delivered to the White House. When legislative action resumes after Labor Day, the Members will be chomping to get away for the election campaign.

Whatever fate awaits the appropriations bills on Capitol Hill and at the White House, it now seems certain that another government shutdown for lack of appropriations will be avoided. With public blame from last winter's closures of federal agencies weighing on Republican reelection prospects, the Congressional leadership plans to adopt a continuing resolution that will keep the money coming in any circumstance.—DSG

Editor and Publisher **Daniel S. Greenberg**
Associate Publisher **Wanda J. Reif**
Circulation Manager **Glen D. Grant**

Published by Science & Government Report, Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July, August, and September. Annual subscriptions: Institutions, $490.00 (two years, $840.00). Bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. NW, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. For subscription service: PO Box 6226A, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. 1-800-522-1970; in Washington, DC 785-5054. SGR is available on University Microfilms International. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six weeks of publication date. ISSN 0048-9581.

. . . No Pork-Barrel Jobs, Advisory Group Head Says

(Continued from Page 1)

operation mainly on call for business as it develops. Serving as President is Robert M. White, former President of the National Academy of Engineering (NAE). Edward E. David Jr., who was President Nixon's Science Advisor, was elected Vice President last month at the Group's first meeting. The Advisory Group's offices are in downtown Washington, at 1200 New York Ave. NW, the recently completed headquarters building of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

White told SGR last week that he plans to work half time for the Group, and that Bruce Guile, who last week left the post of Director of the NAE Program Office, will serve as Managing Director, on a schedule of "somewhat over 50 percent." The Group will not lobby government agencies or officials in behalf of its customers, White said, but will confine its services to advising its clients.

White said the Group has so far signed up one client, Schlumberger Ltd., a New York-headquartered firm that provides seismic services for the oil industry, electronic systems and other products.

The announcement, which subtitles the Advisory Group "An Authoritative Resource on Science, Technology and Enterprise," adopts the tactics of other Washington knowledge hustlers by hinting at wondrous powers and connections for deciphering the mysteries of the federal government for the benefit of its clients. Declaring that the federal system "for funding, managing and conducting federal research and development defies easy understanding," the announcement states that "The Group represents a distinguished assemblage of scientists and engineers with unparalleled experience in and knowledge of the federal research and development system and the changing policies that shape it."

As policies and programs in the public and private sectors "change in response to scientific and technological opportunities," the announcement continues, "organizations may wish to consult nationally recognized authorities about their views on R&D policy trends."

Addressing the various major sectors of prospective business, the announcement states, "Universities are faced with questions on how to structure their research, development and educational efforts in light of the changing trends in federal government and private sector funding. Government agencies and private corporations are continually faced with choices about how to allocate and focus research and development resources to advance their goals." The announcement states that members of the Group "possess a wealth of experience in international affairs," adding that "The Group is prepared to assemble authoritative international leaders in science and engineering to address client needs."

Asked by SGR whether the Group would break with the establishment party line and help individual universities pursue pork-barrel, otherwise known as earmarked, appropriations, Group President White emphatically said no.

The Founding 9 Members

Listed by the Washington Advisory Group as founding Members and Senior Fellows:

Erich Bloch, Director of the National Science Foundation, 1984-90; former Vice President of IBM and Fellow of the Council on Competitiveness; currently at George Mason Univ.

D. Allan Bromley, Science and Technology Advisor to President Bush, 1989-93; currently Dean of Engineering, Yale Univ.

Edward E. David Jr., Science and Technology Advisor to President Nixon, 1970-73; former President of Exxon Research and Engineering and Executive Director of Bell Labs; currently a private consultant.

Alexander H. Flax, President of the Institute for Defense Analyses, 1969-83; former Assistant Secretary of the Air Force and Home Secretary of the National Academy of Engineering.

Robert A. Frosch, Vice President of General Motors, 1982-93; Administrator of NASA, 1977-81, and Assistant Secretary of the Navy for R&D; currently, Senior Research Fellow, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard.

Frank Press, Science&Technology Advisor to President Carter, 1977-80; President, National Academy of Sciences, 1981-93; currently, at Carnegie Institution of Washington.

Alan Schriesheim, Director, Argonne National Laboratory, 1984-96; formerly Engineering Executive, Exxon Corp.

Robert M. White, President, National Academy of Engineering, 1983-95; Administrator, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 1970-77.

James Wyngaarden, Director, National Institutes of Health, 1982-89; Associate Director, White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, 1989-90, and former Foreign Secretary of National Academy of Sciences.

But when asked the pork question, another of the founding nine told SGR, "We'll face that problem when we come to it." He added that he expected that most of the business would be from universities, "but we don't know who the customers will be." That founder also said that the new organization "is not primarily a money-making affair, though we hope to make some money."

President White said the Group "will not bid on government jobs," but will provide assistance "if a government agency feels we can help." The Group would not serve *pro bono* in such cases, he said, but would work "at no loss."

The announcement did not state the fees charged by the Group. As a purely "advisory" organization of part-timers, the new organization is unusual if not unique among Washington firms claiming insider knowledge and connections. Many of the firms in this line of work are unabashed, officially registered lobbyists. Competition is intense and fees vary widely. Individuals and organizations hungry for business—and there are many of them—will gratefully accept a few thousand dollars to sniff out a particular problem or issue for a client. The big, well-connected lobbying organizations can command annual retainers, with a minimum of $20,000 a month no rarity.

Interim Head Takes Over at Engineering Academy

Daggers are sheathed and the rumor mill is on low at the National Academy of Engineering (NAE) following the ouster of President Harold Liebowitz and the arrival on July 17 of an interim replacement, William A. Wulf, Professor of Engineering, on leave from the University of Virginia.

"We're trying to pick up the pieces," Wulf told SGR in a telephone conversation last week. The problems to be dealt with, he said, include staff morale, battered under Liebowitz's loner style of management, and "perceptions on the part of the members that the NAE is controlled by an old-boy network." Wulf sounded optimistic, saying the morale is "better than I expected," and that the members are eager to help. In the works, he said, are reforms to broaden membership participation in the NAE's governance—a roundabout concession to the grievances that Liebowitz exploited in winning the NAE Presidency last year as an anti-establishment candidate.

Wulf, former chief of computer engineering at the National Science Foundation, was elected to the NAE in 1993, and has served as Chairman of the Computer Science and Telecommunications Board of the National Research Council, the operating arm of the Academy complex. While holding the interim Presidency at the NAE, he's on a one-year leave from his academic post.

On the losing side of a 1179-179 recall vote from among the 1800 NAE members, Liebowitz quietly left the Academy early in July and has since maintained public silence. During the many crises of his year-long administration, he repeatedly hinted to SGR and others that he would take legal action to overturn efforts to remove him from office. Elected in 1995 for a Presidential term newly extended from four to six years, he said he intended to serve the full measure, describing the ouster move as an underhanded attempt to negate the will of the members. He may be planning a court challenge, but so far, there's no public sign of it, and the customarily talkative Liebowitz has not returned numerous calls from SGR or shown up in other publications.

Wulf told SGR, "I don't anticipate any legal action." He acknowledged that "negotiations are ongoing" about a financial settlement with Liebowitz, whose annual salary as NAE President was at least $250,000, plus various perks. Liebowitz's lawyers at Washington's Williams & Connolly would say nothing about his affairs. A colleague who met with Liebowitz in July said he was in good spirits and even joked about his ouster from the Presidency—which he had long sought, and finally achieved, at age 72.

The vote to depose Liebowitz was so overwhelming that his legitimacy as head of the nation's leading engineering society is gone—no matter how a court might rule on a restoration effort. Up to the end, Liebowitz, with apparent confidence, was counting on support from the members who gave him 43 percent of the vote in his first Presidential run, in 1991, and put him over the top in 1995 by 697-660. In May, around the same time that the NAE Council sent out ballots for members to vote on his recall, Liebowitz conducted a poll of members, asking them, among other things, whether he or the Council should be removed from office. He has not disclosed the results of his poll.

The management of the NAE and the National Research Council—its joint operating arm with the National Academy of Sciences—was holding a series of meetings at the end of July, with recuperation from the recent upheavals on the agenda.

Wulf told SGR that plans for the post-Liebowitz NAE call for relaxing the tightly controlled process of nominating candidates for NAE office. Under the current system, candidates are chosen by a nominating committee appointed by the NAE Council—a closed-loop that Liebowitz twice circumvented through the cumbersome and rarely used process of getting on the ballot as a petition candidate. Wulf said that under the contemplated change, the NAE's disciplinary sections, rather than the Council, would determine the membership of the nominating committee. "We aim to make participation as open as it can be," Wulf said.

The embrace of openness amounts to an acceptance of the complaints and grievances that put Liebowitz into office. Charging that the NAE is run by a dug-in clique, he won a surprising 43 percent of the vote in his first run for the Presidency, in 1991, and gained office on that theme when he ran last year. His Presidency crumbled because of his solo style of management in an institution laden with committees, and also because of his hostility to close cooperation with the National Academy of Sciences, far older and richer than the NAE and possessor of the Congressional charter for both Academies.

Wulf said he expects that a new President will be elected and installed by next spring or, at the latest, "by this time next year."

Electronic Progress at NSF

The National Science Foundation says it is making progress toward electronic management via the Internet of its voluminous dealings with the scientific community. But paper is still the main means of communication for grant applications, peer reviews and other transactions with the Foundation.

An NSF Internet program, known as FastLane, which became widely available in the fall of 1995, is undergoing testing with 16 universities. And last month, to encourage familiarity with electronic transactions, NSF began requiring electronic filing for one of its programs, the Recognition Award for the Integration of Research and Education.

The move toward eliminating paper is handled by the NSF Office of Information Resource Management; Gerald Glaser is the Acting Director.

To access FastLane: http://www.fastlane.nsf.gov/

Non-Profit Pay Checks

Association of American Medical Colleges

Salaries of senior executives at the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) are on a par with the rates of other wealthy Washington-based tax-exempt, non-profit organizations. But the AAMC, the trade association for the nation's 125 mainstream medical schools and 400 teaching hospitals, also provides a benefit that SGR has not previously encountered in its extensive examinations of senior non-profit pay and perks: real-estate "bridge loans" at below-market rates.

In prior times, the AAMC owned and provided a residence for its President, and declared on its tax returns that the chief was "required" to live there for carrying out "administrative, ceremonial and social duties of the office." But the last occupant, Robert Petersdorf, said the premises were leaky and drafty. He moved out prior to his retirement from the AAMC in March 1994 and the Association sold the house later that year.

New Law Makes It Easier to View Non-Profit Returns—P. 6

Presidential residences, in Washington, are currently provided for the heads of the Association of American Universities and the National Academy of Sciences, whose President chips in $1400 a month—50 percent of the total—for the condo fee on the NAS presidential pad, in the Watergate complex.

The AAMC's fiscal data, with notations on its mortgage assistance, are contained in the organization's latest filing of IRS Form 990, for tax year 1994, covering the AAMC fiscal year July 1, 1994, to June 30, 1995. Under a routine extension, the tax return was filed in March 1996. It shows the following:

Jordan J. Cohen, who became President of the AAMC in April 1994, received annual compensation of $307,000, plus $46,050 in benefits, and $118,438 in "expense account and other allowances." In the fiscal aggregate, Cohen, former Dean of the Medical School and Director of the Medical Center of the State University of New York at Stony Brook, appears to come out ahead of his AAMC predecessor. The AAMC tax return for Petersdorf's last full year at the Association reports direct compensation of $330,000, plus $33,000 in benefits and deferred income and $10,572 in expenses.

The tax returns also report that for the "purchase [of a] residence," the AAMC in May 1994 provided Cohen with a 10-year bridge loan of $476,694 at 4.8 percent interest payable monthly. Interest on loans from conventional sources vary according to duration and other circumstances. For most long-term loans, the interest rate in the Washington, DC, area at that time was approximately 7 percent. The tax return states that the loan is secured by "deed of trust [for the] residence" and is to be paid off in a "balloon note," which means the full amount no later than the expiration date of the loan, in May 2003.

Five-year residential bridge loans of $400,000 each, starting in 1994 and also at 4.8 percent interest, were reported for Thomas F. Moberg, Vice President, and David Altman, Associate Vice President (who left the AAMC for another job earlier this year). Their salaries and benefits were not stated on the return, which includes headings for "officers, directors, trustees and key employes" and the five highest-paid employes. The terminology is confusing, but that's it.

In response to an inquiry from SGR, Edwin Crocker, AAMC Vice President for Administrative Services, said that many organizations provide real-estate bridge loans for new employes until they arrange regular financing. He said all AAMC employes are eligible for such loans, and that the practice has been approved by the IRS. Altman retired his bridge loan when he left the AAMC, Crocker said, and since then another has been added for a new employe, making a total of three in effect at the organization, whose staff numbers 287.

The tax-return data on the AAMC's top five employes shows benefits and deferred compensation at 10 percent of each individual's direct compensation, reported as follows, first for 1994 and then for 1993:

Robert Dickler, Vice President, 1994, $240,000 in direct compensation (plus $24,800 in expenses and other allowances); 1993, $228,000 ($31,815 in expenses, etc.; no expenses listed for the following in top five).

Joseph Keyes, Senior Vice President, 1994 direct compensation, $200,000; 1993, $177,000.

Donald Kassebaum, Vice President, $190,000; $170,000.

John Diggs, $200,000; $200,000.

Herbert Nickens, $185,000; $157,000.

Listed along with AAMC President Cohen under officers, directors, etc., is Richard Knapp, Executive Vice President, with 1994 compensation of $252,000 plus the AAMC's standard 10 percent in benefits and deferred compensation. No expenses or other allowances were listed for Knapp, who moved to his present post in 1994, when he was a Senior Vice President, with direct compensation reported at $220,000 on the 1992 tax return.

The AAMC reported revenues of $35.8 million on its 1994 tax return, and a $2.4 million "excess," which would be considered profits outside of non-profit bookkeeping. In 1993, revenues totaled $36.5 million and the excess was $5.5 million. About half of the AAMC's income comes from administering the Medical College Application Test and the centralized application service for medical-school admissions. The balance is mainly from membership dues, seminars, publications, etc.

Previously published Pay Checks: Howard Hughes Medical Institute, April 15; National Academy of Sciences, May 1; American Chemical Society, May 15; American Psychological Association, June 1; American Association for the Advancement of Science, June 15; American Psychiatric Association, July 1.

Next: American Council on Education

New Law Expands Access to Non-Profit Returns

It's going to be easier for anyone to obtain copies of the tax returns of tax-exempt organizations under recently passed legislation assured of Presidential approval. Directly affected are non-profit organizations, such as scientific and professional societies, philanthropic foundations and educational institutions, which commonly hold tax exemptions under sections 501(c)(3) and (4) of the Internal Revenue Code.

The accessibility provisions are included in the "Taxpayer Bill of Rights 2" (HR 2337), which also raises the penalties for fiscal hanky-panky conducted under the guise of charitable activities, while providing taxpayers with protections against strongarm tactics by the IRS.

Under existing legislation, the affected non-profits are required to provide copies of their tax returns, IRS Form 990, for inspection upon request at their main and branch offices. They don't have to provide copies for taking away and they don't have to mail copies to distant parties. The "Bill of Rights" requires mail service "without charge, other than a reasonable fee for reproduction and mailing costs" within 30 days of a written request.

The legislative change may appear slight. But in practical terms, it opens the window wider on non-profit financial affairs. Though the 990s are legally available to all comers, employes, contractors and others directly involved with specific non-profits are understandably timid when it comes to requesting tax records that include salaries and other customarily shielded financial data.

Non-profit employes sometimes prod SGR to report on their work places, deeming it perhaps perilous to request the 990s themselves. The eased accessibility is likely to bring in many mail requests in behalf of shy people who would like to see for themselves.

The new legislation also provides for a modest increase in the modest penalties for non-compliance with 990 requests. For uncooperative organizations, the present penalty, $10 a day to a maximum of $5000, is raised to $20 a day and $20,000. But for "willful failure to allow public inspection or provide copies," the penalty rises from the present total of $1000 to $5000.

The sunshine law for non-profit tax returns aroused some puzzlement and resistance when it went into effect nearly a decade ago and strangers arrived at non-profit offices and requested the records. But, in SGR's experience, after some early balks, non-profit officers and managers now take the requests in stride and cooperate without a quibble.

The legislation will go into effect when the President signs it, which is expected soon.

Job Changes & Appointments

Anne Petersen, Deputy Director of the National Science Foundation since July 1994, will be moving in September to the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Michigan, where she will be Senior Vice President for Programs. Prior to joining NSF, Petersen, a statistician specializing in studies of adolescence, was Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School at the University of Minnesota. The post she's vacating is number two in the NSF hierarchy, and, with responsibility for the internal management of the Foundation, also holds the title of Chief Operating Officer. The Deputy Director job is a Presidential appointment, which means that, given the clearance backup at the election-preoccupied White House, a long time is likely to elapse before a successor is selected, checked out, nominated, and confirmed by the Senate. When Petersen leaves, an Acting Deputy Director, almost surely from within NSF ranks, will fill in. The Kellogg Foundation concentrates on community development, health and education in the US, Latin America and the Caribbean and southern Africa.

The President has announced his intentions to make five nominations for NSF's policymaking body, the badly depleted National Science Board, which fell short of a quorum at its July meeting, following the expiration of eight of its 24 memberships in May. The five are: ***John Armstrong***, former IBM VP; ***M.R.C. Greenwood***, Chancellor, UC Santa Cruz; ***Stanley V. Jaskolski***, VP, Eaton Corp.; ***Vera Rubin***, Carnegie Institution of Washington, and ***Bob Suzuki***, President, California Polytechnic University, Pomona.

At the National Cancer Institute: ***Edison Liu***, Chief of Molecular Genetics in the Department of Medicine at the University of North Carolina School of Medicine, has been appointed head of NCI's newly created Division of Clinical Sciences. ***Otis W. Brawley***, a Senior Investigator and Program Director in NCI's Community Oncology and Rehabilitation Branch, has been named head of a new Office of Special Populations, with responsibility for expanding NCI programs to racial, ethnic and underserved populations.

Marilyn Lloyd, Chair of the House Science Subcommittee on Energy before retiring from a 20-year Congressional career in 1995, has become an associate of the Spectrum Group, a Washington lobbying and consulting firm. She'll remain resident in Tennessee, where she recently was appointed to the Chattanooga Airport Authority.

NASA's National Technology Transfer Center, at Wheeling (W. Va.) Jesuit University, has announced the appointment of ***Thomas F. Burgoyne***, a retired FBI agent, as Deputy Director of its Office of Law Enforcement Technology Commercialization. The announcement says he'll work on bringing "quality technology and products to the law enforcement community faster, cheaper and more effectively."

Glenn E. Taylor, a Vice President of the Engelhard Corporation, Iselin, NJ, will succeed ***Richard E. Emmert*** as Executive Director of the 59,000 member American Institute of Chemical Engineers, effective September 1.

In Print

(Continued from Page 8)

From NASA and the Congressional General Accounting Office, two related reports, no charge:

The Management and Liquidation of Budget Authority: Issues and Recommendations Associated with Recent Growth in Unliquidated Budget Authority (67 pp., no charge), an internal NASA report designed to explain the growth of appropriated but unspent and uncommitted money within the agency in a period of steeply declining budgets. Over the past three fiscal years, says the report, such "unliquidated budget authority" has risen by $1.3 billion, to a total of $7.8 billion, which is slightly more than NASA's current annual appropriation. The swollen accounts have given rise to suspicions of what House Space Subcommittee Chairman James Sensenbrenner (R-Wisconsin) described as "dangerously close to padding budgets" in an anticipation of reductions. That's not the case, said NASA chief Dan Goldin July 18 at a Subcommittee hearing on "NASA's Uncosted Carryovers." Drawing on the report, prepared at the Johnson Space Center, Goldin said a substantial backlog is necessary for the long-term engineering projects common to NASA, and that growth in unspent funds is attributable to massive restructuring within NASA, paperwork delays, and other administrative causes. NASA is not piling up funds in expectation of lower budgets, he said.

Order from: Wayne L. Draper, Chief Financial Officer, Mail Code LA, Johnson Space Center, Houston, Texas 77058; tel. 713/483-0579; fax 713/483-3930.

NASA Budget: Carryover Balances in Selected Programs (GAO/T-NSIAD-96-206 and 207), a statement for the hearing and a letter to Chairman Sensenbrenner by Thomas J. Shulz, a GAO Associate Director, who said NASA is getting better on fiscal management, but "has not yet reached the point where it fully understands individual programs' carryover balances and what each program's carryover threshold could or should be."

Order from: USGAO, PO Box 6015, Gaithersburg, Md. 20884-6015; tel. 202/512-6000; fax 301/258-4066.

From the American Enterprise Institute (AEI):

The Department of Energy: An Agency That Cannot Be Reinvented (47 pp., $9.95 plus $3.50 for shipping), another salvo at DOE, which has so far eluded its would-be terminators on Capitol Hill. This one, by Irwin Selzer, Director of Regulatory Studies at AEI, a conservative think tank, notes the general dismay with DOE's bumbling efforts to clean up the nuclear contamination around its plants, scorns DOE's role in energy markets, and doubts the sense of DOE's research priorities. DOE Secretary O'Leary and predecessors have tried to respond to these and other criticisms, Selzer concedes, but "all have failed, broken on the reef of the department's entrenched procedures and bureaucracy."

Order from: AEI Press, c/o Publisher Resources, Inc., 1224 Heil Quaker Blvd., PO Box 7001, La Vergne, Tenn. 37086-7001; tel. 1/800-269-6267; fax 1-800/774-6733.

From the General Accounting Office, no charge:

Federal Statistics: Principal Statistical Agencies' Missions and Funding (GAO/GGD-96-107; 16 pp.), summarizes the responsibilities of the 11 major agencies that collect and process statistical data for the federal government. In fiscal 1995, they received $1.3 billion in federal appropriations, plus reimbursements from government and private organizations. The report was requested by House Budget Chairman John Kasich and Chairman Stephen Horn of the Government Reform and Oversight Subcommittee on Government Management, Information and Technology.

Water Quality: A Catalog of Related Federal Programs (GAO/RCED-96-173; 64 pp.), describes the water management and research programs of federal departments and agencies, including Defense, Agriculture, Interior and the National Science Foundation.

Forest Service's Reforestation Funding: Financial Sources, Uses, and Condition of the Knutson-Vandenberg Fund (GAO/RCED-96-15; 60 pp.), says the US Forest Service is waddling in fiscal confusion in administering the fund, legislated in 1930 to finance reforestation. Planned projects are estimated at $942 million, the GAO reports, while unobligated funds total $338 million. The shortfall is attributed to transfers of money to fire-fighting, but the report also says that the Forest Service "lacks reliable financial management information and controls to ensure compliance" with the legislation.

Chemical Accident Safety: EPA's Responsibilities for Preparedness, Response, and Prevention (GAO/PEMD-96-3; 48 pp.), concludes that EPA "has vigorous programs for accident preparedness and response," but needs to put more effort into complying with legislation that emphasizes accident prevention.

Order from: USGAO, PO Box 6015, Gaithersburg, Md. 20884-6015; tel. 202/512-6000; fax 301/258-4066.

In Print

Official reports and other publications of special interest to the research community

(Copies of publications listed here are available from the indicated sources—not from SGR)

From the White House National Science and Technology Council, Committee on Civilian Industry Technology:

Technology in the National Interest (87 pp., no charge), in the guise of just another federal report, a political tract that says deep federal involvement in direct and subsidized development of commercial technologies extends far back in history and has enriched the economy and society in general, with contemporary products ranging from frozen orange juice to medical diagnostics and treatments. Congressional Republicans, of course, think otherwise and have been slashing, with mixed success, at the Clinton Administration's industrial-aid programs. The report, in slick, four-color magazine format, was prepared in the Commerce Department, homebase of the industry-government Advanced Technology Program, slashed by Congress, but still alive.

Order from: US Department of Commerce, Office of Technology Policy, Room 4814C, Washington, DC 20230; tel. 202/482-3037; fax 202/482-4817.

Note: Still available, a companion publication from 1993: *Science in the National Interest* (31 pp., no charge). Order from: Office of Science and Technology Policy, Room 431, Old Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20502; tel. 202/395-7347; fax 202/456-6022.

From the National Academy of Sciences:

Vaccines Against Malaria: Hope in a Gathering Storm (30 pp., limited supply without charge), criticizes the scanty, declining research on malaria, which annually kills several million people and seriously sickens hundreds of millions. The US, however, is virtually free of disease, which accounts for malaria's bottom-level in American research priorities. Nonetheless, tourism, military operations and commitments to third-world economic development feed concerns about neglect of the disease. The report, based on a workshop held last fall by the Institute of Medicine (IOM), health policy arm of the NAS, cites promising developments in molecular biology and immunology, and recommends establishment of a federal Malaria Vaccine Development Board to spur and coordinate research by academe, industry, and government. The report was produced by the IOM's Committee on Malaria Vaccines, chaired by Philip K. Russell, Professor of International Health, Johns Hopkins University. Christopher P. Howson of the IOM staff directed the study, which was financed by the MacArthur and Rockefeller foundations, the Burroughs Wellcome Fund, NIH, and the Naval Medical Research Institute.

Order from: National Academy of Sciences, IOM, Board on International Health, 2101 Constitution Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20418; tel. 202/334-2427; fax 202/334-3861.

SGR Summer Schedule

The next issue of *Science & Government Report* will be published September 15, 1996.

Xenotransplantation: Science, Ethics, and Public Policy (126 pp., $29 plus $4 shipping), says the potential benefits of transplants from animals into humans outweigh the risks of disease transmissions. But, assessing the risks as "unequivocally greater than zero," the report praises the FDA and the CDC for developing guidelines, soon to be released, and urges adherence by researchers. Proceed, but with caution, is theme of the report, produced by the IOM Committee on Xenograft Transplantation: Ethical Issues and Public Policy, chaired by Norman G. Levinsky, Chairman, Department of Medicine, Boston University. The study was co-directed by Constance Pechura and Ralph Dell of the IOM staff.

Airline Passenger Security Screening: New Technologies and Implementation Issues (74 pp., $28 plus $4 for shipping), published pre-TWA 800, by the Panel on Passenger Screening of the NAS Committee on Commercial Aviation Security, says public and airline acceptability of security measures depends on perception of threat. Warning that airlines are likely to skimp on security if the public balks at check-in procedures, the report urges education programs "to inform the public about the advantages and the perceived disadvantages of screening technologies." The Panel was chaired by George W. Swenson Jr., Professor-emeritus of Electrical and Computer Engineering and of Astronomy, University of Illinois, Urbana. Sandra Hyland of the Academy staff was Senior Program Manager for the report.

Landslides: Investigation and Mitigation (Special Report 247, Transportation Research Board [TRB] ; 673 pp., hardcover $48.75, softcover, $33.75 for TRB affiliates; $65 and $45 for non-affiliates), with contributions from over a score of specialists, first new edition since 1978 of a standard work, covering field investigations, laboratory testing, case studies, etc. The editors are A. Keith Turner, Professor of Geology, Colorado School of Mines, and Robert L. Schuster, US Geological Survey.

Order from: National Academy Press, 2101 Constitution Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20418; tel. 1-800/624-6242 or 202/334-3313.

From the Harvard Sussex Program on CBW Armament and Arms Limitation:

Chemical Weapons Convention Bulletin (quarterly, 40 pp., $40 for individuals and non-profits; $100 for "corporate bodies"), news, official documents, meeting reports, etc., concerning international control of chemical and biological weapons. Edited by Matthew Meselson, Harvard University, and Julian Perry Robinson, University of Sussex, in the UK, the publication seeks to eliminate the weapons "and help prevent the exploitation of biomedical technologies for hostile purposes."

Order from: Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology, Harvard University, 7 Divinity Ave., Cambridge, Mass. 02138; tel. 617/495-2264; fax 617/496-2444.

(Continued on Page 7)